



between the school system and industry, the Connection would be the mortar to pull these together.

Mr. Garvis explained that initially they would focus on mathematics and science. In conjunction with school system staff, they were defining what the resource needs were, and Mr. Jordan was taking the lead in developing a computerized resource data base. The next step would be to select a model school to test their concepts and make sure they were capturing the data base correctly. They hoped to be able to pilot this program in six schools in the fall of 1985. Once this was completed, they would implement the program countywide. Then they would move on to other subject areas.

Mr. Garvis stated that Mrs. Sally Keeler was the executive vice-president of the Connection, and the school system had permitted her to work half time on this project. He said that Mrs. Keeler was providing excellent cooperation with the members of the foundation. He said that in addition to Mrs. Keeler's time, the school system would be providing in-service training. Once the data base was operational, someone would have to supervise that data base. They would also need some school-based coordinators at the building level.

\*Dr. Greenblatt joined the meeting at this point.

Mr. Garvis said that the next question was how they were going to be funded. At present they were contributing their energies in kind. They would be soliciting memberships from the business community, and the First American Bank would be hosting a membership breakfast on November 28. They were asking companies to contribute \$500 per year for the next three years to participate in the Connection. He stated that industry and the school system had needs for resources, and the Connection intended to be that link.

Dr. Cody thought that they had the potential for the involvement of hundreds of businesses in Montgomery County. Mrs. Praisner recalled that she had attended the Connection's organizational meeting, and she thought they had come a long way since then. She said that this was an exciting venture, and she thanked the members of the executive board on behalf of the Board of Education, the students and teachers of Montgomery County. She asked that Board members be kept informed, especially about the breakfast on November 28.

Dr. Shoenberg expressed his gratitude for the efforts the Connection was making. He asked that they look at the question of keeping bright young people in teaching. He thought the solution might lie in an ability to have these young people move back and forth between the schools and places engaged in research activities.

Dr. Floyd remarked that it was important for members of the Board of Education to be as involved as much as possible with this effort. He, too, would like to participate in the November 28 meeting. Dr. Cody commented that this was a big step forward in relationships with the business community. He called attention to the

contribution of Mr. Shulman, who was now serving on the state Board of Education. He announced that the Mini-dealership had just been cited by the President as one of eight outstanding vocational programs in the United States. He said that a special thanks should go to Larry Shulman for this program.

Resolution No. 540-84                      Re: Utilization of a Portion of the FY  
1985 Provision for Future  
Supported Projects for  
Computerized Adaptive Testing  
System Program

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend, within the FY 1985 Provision for Future Supported Projects, a \$5,000 grant award from the Maryland State Department of Education in the following categories to develop a prototype, using a computerized adaptive testing program:

Category	Amount
01 Administrative	\$4,800
10 Fixed Charges	200
Total	\$5,000

and be it further

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

Resolution No. 541-84                      Re: Presentation of Preliminary Plans  
- South Germantown Elementary  
School (Area 3)

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

WHEREAS, The architect for South Germantown Elementary School, SHWC, Inc., has prepared the schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

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

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Board of Education approves the schematic design report prepared by SHWC, Inc.

For the record, Mrs. Praisner stated that the Board approved the plans with the understanding that staff would get back to the Board with information on the size of the all-purpose room and that the

school would be bid with the planetarium as an alternate.

Re: Annual Report of the Advisory  
Committee on Counseling and  
Guidance, 1983-84

Ms. Susan Goldstein, chairman, expressed the committee's appreciation to the Board for reappointment of committee members whose terms were about to expire. She asked whether Board members had questions about the report.

Miss Duby stated that she was happy to read some of the recommendations of the committee. In regard to the standardization of guidance services, she wondered whether the committee had discussed a model that worked best in a school. Dr. Darryl Laramore, supervisor of guidance, replied that in middle schools and junior high schools the model that worked best was grade-level counselors because the schools were usually organized into teams. At the senior high level it appeared to be more effective to have student load assigned alphabetically because load by grade level was so diverse. For example, the senior class counselor would have to do all of the college recommendations. He stated that there was a great deal of autonomy for principals to use counselors in different ways. When the policy was started in 1974 they attempted to have the Board include all of those duties that counselors should not be assigned. The Board did not adopt this. Mr. James Gorman, counselor, added that at the high school level they did not have a standardized delivery of a college counseling program for Grades 9-12. Therefore, a lot was left up to the individual schools. This year schools were developing guidance operational plans by doing an internal survey of the students. Mrs. Praisner commented that this was tied to their next point about what students could expect from counselors.

Ms. Kathy McGuire, counselor, said that at the elementary school level they were looking at standardization because they had so many new counselors. Dr. Laramore thought there should be a basic program at each developmental level. The individuality of the school would be assessed through a needs assessment.

Miss Duby indicated that they had talked about increased clerical support. She asked whether schools were taking the initiative in handling this themselves and whether they were seeing parent volunteers and student aides. Ms. Goldstein replied that in some reports coming back to them this was an expressed need, particularly at the high school level. Dr. Laramore added that some of the guidance advisory committees were taking on some of the tabulation of the needs assessments and running career days. Principals could also use clerical staff differently. However, some schools were getting more services than others because of the priorities in that school.

Miss Duby remarked that they had done a great deal of talking about in-service training for teachers. It seemed to her that guidance

counselors did not have a sufficient chance to really practice their skills, improve their skills, or share with one another. Dr. Laramore replied that they had received \$4,500 from the state and had asked the counselors what they needed. One of the high priorities countywide was adolescent depression and suicide. They had asked for in-service training in this area. Another issue was working with children in single parent families and also a support group for parents. This year they had requesting training in nutrition and family systems counseling. Ms. McGuire added that the elementary counselors had felt the need for this training and had gone out on their own to get this training.

Dr. Cronin reported that he had raised a number of questions in the pre-Board conference about costs. He expected his questions would be answered when the staff response was prepared. He assumed they had a list of the duties that counselors should not have to perform and asked to see a copy. He asked the committee to think about why they should have a central office managerial support for counselors. He explained that they faced this type of question in justifying the Board's budget. He felt it was important for the committee to take their best shot at the support mechanisms they needed and to make a public statement. Ms. Goldstein replied that it was very hard to measure prevention in terms of the time that counselors put in to help a student function better within the classroom where they did see outcomes. If a counselor's time was spent filling out forms, the counselor could not counsel students with problems. She said it was very hard to document in the same sense as a classroom teacher. In regard to the central office support, she thought counselors needed direction from a counseling person and needed assistance with training. She said that the counselor-specialist position was very helpful in terms of training and support.

Dr. Cronin called attention to mention in the report of split positions and the inequity of counseling load. Ms. Goldstein referred him to Appendix B. In the split positions, the guidelines for the assignment of numbers of students to counselors is 350 to 1. The Carnegie Report recommended 200 to 1. In Area 1 elementary schools, the counselors had 800 to 1100 students if they were divided between two schools. In Area 3, many of the schools had 800, 900, and 1,000 students and one counselor. Ms. McGuire reported that there were also split positions at the high school level. Ms. Elizabeth Arnold added that a lot of energy was spent in going from school to school and trying to gear up with the situation in that particular school.

Dr. Cronin requested information on the difficulties of mental health referrals. Dr. Laramore replied that he and the chair of the Pupil Personnel Workers Association had gone to the Mental Health Advisory Committee and made their case for why both counselors and PPW's should be included in the mental health workers of the school system to make direct referrals to outside agencies. Mrs. Praisner suggested that they seek a response from the Mental Health Advisory Committee, and Dr. Cody said he would talk with Dr. Laramore about

this issue and see what the options were.

Dr. Cronin asked whether it would fall to the regular counselor to counsel handicapped students and be cognizant of the full range of students. Dr. Laramore replied that there were counselors for the hearing impaired, sight impaired, and orthopedically handicapped at the elementary level. However, at the secondary level, handicapped students were served by the counseling staff with regular training and regular certification. Ms. Diane Graham added that in the learning centers a number of faculty members did take up the counseling work load because students in the centers tended to turn to their teachers for help.

Mr. Ewing commented that they had trouble selling the notion of expanded numbers of counselors to the county executive, County Council, and the general public because they had been unable to explain what it was they were trying to do. In regard to the management of a high school, a high school principal has a very large amount of discretion in assigning staff members to do administrative chores and the responsibility for making sure the tasks get done. He said they might be destroying their own ability to be effective with counselors by putting principals in a situation where they do not have enough help to get tasks done. This was an issue that the school system as a whole needed to address. They might need not only more counselors but also more help at the high school level to make sure jobs got done. He was not sure they could make a good case because they needed to be able to describe in as concrete a way as possible the network of supports that they thought ought to exist for students. They tended to focus on what counselors needed and less on what students needed. If they were able to describe this in terms of what counselors provided to students and in terms of the other support network people such as psychologists they might make a better case. He felt that they had to make a clear and articulate case about their needs in the way of a whole network of support. He said it was important for them to focus not only on those students interested in postsecondary education but on the students who were not. He thought that these students sometimes did not get as much attention because the assumption was that they did not need it, but they did. He was concerned about students suffering from handicaps, and he was not sure they were not shortchanging kids by not giving counselors more opportunities to learn more about those handicaps so that they could be of more help.

Ms. Goldstein thought it was important to get training for counselors to work with special education students. She remarked that the whole counselor system had trouble articulating what it did. She said that they all eagerly awaited the guidance study and recommendations for budget.

Mr. Ewing asked the superintendent to comment about principals and counselors. Dr. Cody replied that this phenomenon did happen because the work had to be done. He also had experience with this phenomenon regarding newly hired elementary school librarians

because they were the only people other than the principal who did not have a scheduled class all the time. He thought that both sides had to be looked at because it was not done frivolously. He noted that he had no sense of the magnitude of this in Montgomery County.

Mr. Gorman stated that counselors were caring and interested people. Ideally if individuals were big and broad enough they could become experts in dealing with college counseling, the handicapped, and minorities. He sensed a great frustration level of trying to deliver the services on as broad-based a situation and to meet the needs of the local administration. He cited some clerical tasks that counselors and administrators were doing and suggested that clerical assistance would help here.

Dr. Cody suspected that high schools had a long tradition of calling on guidance counselors to do things that were not in the framework of their jobs. However, because there were so few elementary school counselors, he did not think there was a great deal of that going on. However, if they continued to add elementary guidance counselors and not have a clear understanding of their functions, the phenomenon might get worse.

It seemed to Dr. Shoenberg that there was a large difference between what counselors were trained to do and what they were called upon to do. He said that it did not take a master's degree to be an academic advisor or a college counselor, and yet that was the bulk of the job for many counselors at the high school level. If they were going to look at the range of services that needed to be provided to students, this raised the question of who was going to provide these services. Did they need as many counselors as they had now? Did they need counselors with their specialized training engaged in routine, repetitive tasks that were not counseling tasks? For example, being a college counselor was only a counseling task occasionally. He wondered whether they needed more differentiation of function. Ms. Goldstein replied that the guidance study was looking at the portion of time spent on clerical tasks.

Dr. Laramore remarked that there was a counseling duty related to scheduling and there was a clerical duty related to scheduling. They had had a model at Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School where they had an office of information, with a registrar's assistant and extra clerical staff. The counselor did only the counseling aspect, and the other tasks were turned over to the clerical staff. The model was successful and eventually expanded to four schools. Later on at two schools the principal chose to use clerical staff in different ways and the model was discontinued.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that there were differences in what a counselor was trained to do and what a counselor was allowed to do. He hoped that the committee and the counseling study would address this issue head on. It became a resource issue as well as an issue of function. Mrs. Praisner thought this was supposed to be part of



1 credit for math including half a credit for computer math  
1 credit for science  
1 credit for social studies including world history or non U.S.  
history  
1/2 credit for art, music, or drama

and be it further

Resolved, That the total number of credits for graduation be increased from 20 to 22; and be it further

Resolved, That these requirements be implemented for September, 1983 for the graduating class of 1988; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent develop a proposal for a certificate of academic excellence to be awarded with the general diploma by the Board for the class of 1987.

On July 12, 1983, Mrs. Peyser moved and Dr. Greenblatt seconded the following:

Resolved, That Algebra I be a one-credit course whether it is taken in one year, two years, or three years; and be it further

Resolved, That math courses taken to fulfill the two-credit requirement which may be changed to a three-credit requirement be courses in the math department taught by math teachers; and be it further

Resolved, That students be required for graduation to take two years of a foreign language; and be it further

Resolved, That MCPS establish a certificate of academic achievement to be awarded to students who take a specified number of additional academic courses beyond the basic requirements and maintain a specified grade point average and that the requirements for this certificate of academic achievement be developed by the superintendent and approved by the Board of Education.

Resolution No. 543-84                      Re: An Amendment to the Proposed  
Motion on Graduation Requirements  
by Dr. Shoenberg

On motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Dr. Floyd, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Ewing, Dr. Floyd, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Peyser voting in the negative; Dr. Cronin and Dr. Greenblatt abstaining (Miss Duby voting in the affirmative):

Resolved, That the first item be amended to state "one credit for math" and eliminate half a credit for computer math.

There was some confusion about the intent of Dr. Shoenberg's motion. Dr. Shoenberg explained he did not make a motion to

substitute. He made a motion to eliminate including a half credit of computer math. He said they voted to amend the first item by eliminating a phrase. Mrs. Praisner stated that the amendment now before them had one credit for math.

Resolution No. 544-84                      Re: MCPS Graduation Requirements

On motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Dr. Floyd, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Ewing, Dr. Floyd, Dr. Greenblatt, Mrs. Peyser, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin abstaining (Miss Duby voting in the affirmative):

Resolved, That the MCPS Graduation Requirements be increased by one credit in mathematics.

Re: A Motion by Dr. Greenblatt to  
Increase the MCPS Graduation  
Requirements by One Credit in  
Science (FAILED)

A motion by Dr. Greenblatt to increase the MCPS Graduation Requirements by one credit in science failed with Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peyser voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing, Dr. Floyd, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative; Dr. Cronin abstaining (Miss Duby voting in the negative).

Re: A Substitute Motion by Mrs. Peyser  
on Social Studies (FAILED)

A substitute motion by Mrs. Peyser that graduation requirements be increased by half a credit in social studies (World History or non-U.S. History) failed for lack of a second.

Re: A Motion by Dr. Greenblatt on  
Social Studies (FAILED)

A motion by Dr. Greenblatt that MCPS Graduation Requirements be increased by one credit in social studies (World History or non-U.S. History) failed with Dr. Greenblatt, Mrs. Peyser, and Mrs. Praisner voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing, Dr. Floyd, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative; Dr. Cronin abstaining (Miss Duby abstaining).

Resolution No. 546-84                      Re: A Substitute Motion by Mr. Ewing  
on Graduation Requirements

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Mrs. Praisner, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Ewing, Dr. Floyd, Dr. Greenblatt, Mrs. Peyser, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin abstaining (Miss Duby voting in the affirmative):

Resolved, That MCPS Graduation Requirements be increased by one



whether it is taken in one year or two years failed with Dr. Greenblatt, Mrs. Peyser, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Floyd and Mrs. Praisner voting in the negative; Dr. Cronin and Mr. Ewing abstaining (Miss Duby abstaining).

Re: A Motion by Mrs. Peyser on  
Mathematics Courses (FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. Peyser that math courses taken to fulfill the three-credit requirement be courses in the math department taught by math teachers failed with Mrs. Peyser voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing, Dr. Floyd, and Mrs. Praisner voting in the negative; Dr. Cronin, Dr. Greenblatt, and Dr. Shoenberg abstaining (Miss Duby voting in the negative).

Re: A Motion by Mrs. Peyser on Foreign  
Language (FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. Peyser that students be required for graduation to take two years of a foreign language failed with Dr. Greenblatt and Mrs. Peyser voting in the affirmative; Dr. Floyd, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative; Dr. Cronin and Mr. Ewing abstaining (Miss Duby voting in the negative).

Re: A Motion by Mr. Ewing on  
Graduation Requirements

Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Cronin seconded the following:

Resolved, That these decisions be regarded as tentative until such time as the Board can schedule public hearings and consider the public's views on the issues that they raise.

Mrs. Peyser left the meeting at this point.

Resolution No. 550-84                      Re: A Substitute Motion by Dr.  
Shoenberg on MCPS Graduation  
Requirements

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

Resolved, That these decisions be regarded as tentative until such time as the Board of Education can solicit and consider public commentary.

For the record, Mr. Ewing stated that he voted in the negative only because he favored a public hearing.

Dr. Greenblatt left the meeting at this point. She said that she did not agree with the letter to the state Board of Education and,

in particular, cited the second paragraph.

Resolution No. 551-84

Re: State Graduation Requirements -  
Letter to Mr. Schoenbrodt

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education send the proposed letter to the State Board of Education on Graduation Requirements, as modified in discussion.

Re: Board Member Comments

1. Mr. Ewing noted that the Board had received a letter about parking at Bethesda Elementary School. Mrs. Praisner commented that she had discussed this with Mr. Lewis Roberts who assured her he would give the problem consideration. She believed they would have the continuation of the two-hour parking.

2. Miss Duby thought there had been considerable interest in discussing the issue of awarding credit for junior high school students taking high school level courses. She understood this was part of the state's discussion, and she wondered whether this was a closed issue. Dr. Shoenberg replied that it was a closed issue. Miss Duby said that this was an issue that came up again and again in student organizations. She suggested that the Board might want to show its support for that concern.

3. Dr. Cronin said that last week he had been a member of the advisory council to the Literacy Council for Montgomery County. They were attempting to spread to the community the information that there was a program available for adults who were illiterate. He asked that the members of the press and the PTAs assist the Literacy Council in spreading information about their program.

4. Dr. Cronin commented that there had been reports in the press that textbooks tended to be watered down. He hoped that this subject came before the Board in the near future so that the Board could address the perception because the perception might be wrong and do damage.

5. Dr. Cronin indicated that he would be glad to clarify his position on graduation requirements.

6. Mrs. Praisner reported that she had attended the Maryland Association of Boards of Education conference. The Board had nominated Delegate Maurer, and she had been awarded the Willis Award. Mrs. Praisner said that it was a very popular decision. Delegate Maurer had extended her appreciation and thanks to members of the Board of Education of Montgomery County for nominating her for the award.

7. Mrs. Praisner stated that earlier this week there had been a fire in the Burtonsville area near the roadway leading to the elementary school. She asked that the superintendent and staff explore the possibility of relocating the road into the school.

Resolution No. 552-84                      Re: Executive Session - October 22,  
1984

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Dr. Cronin, 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 October 22, 1984, at 11:15 p.m. to discuss a school site item 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.

Resolution No. 553-84                      Re: Executive Session - November 13,  
1984

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 November 13, 1984, 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. 554-84                      Re: Minutes of September 24, 1984

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

Resolved, That the minutes of September 24, 1984, be approved.

Resolution No. 555-84                      Re: BOE Appeal No. 1984-34

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education allow the withdrawal of BOE Appeal No. 1984-34.

Re: Proposed Resolution on JIM School  
Symposium

Dr. Cronin withdrew his proposed resolution on a JIM school symposium and said he would introduce it at the next Board meeting.

Resolution No. 556-84                      Re: Peer Counseling

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion of peer counseling.

Re: Proposed Resolution on Area 2 Task  
Force

On October 9, 1984, Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Floyd seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education and the school system, as well as all students in Area 3, have benefited from the wise advice and excellent recommendations from the Area 3 Task Force, established by the Board in 1983 to advise the Board on Area 3 program and facility needs; and

WHEREAS, The Board has recognized that these area program and facility needs in Area 2 must be addressed, on which the Board needs the advice and recommendations of parents and other citizens; and

WHEREAS, The Board wishes to make certain that the advice it receives takes account of its five priorities, adopted in 1983 and reaffirmed in 1984; and

WHEREAS, The Board would like to be able to take account of Area 2 needs identified by the task force in the 1985-86 school year budget; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education establish an Area 2 Task Force, the purpose of which shall be to identify program and facility needs in Area 2 schools which should be addressed by the school system; and be it further

Resolved, That the task force shall give advice on how its recommendations support and strengthen the school system's efforts to achieve the objectives set forth in the Board of Education's five priorities; and be it further

Resolved, That the task force shall be comprised of representatives from each school in Area 2, and in addition shall include one principal from each level (elementary, JIM and high school) and one teacher from each level, and four other citizens chosen for their areawide and/or countywide perspective, but residing in Area 2; and be it further

Resolved, That the task force shall have a liaison person designated by the superintendent to work with the task force and shall operate under the regulations the Board has established for its advisory committees, including election by the task force of its own chairperson; and be it further

Resolved, That the task force shall convene as soon as possible, so that at least a preliminary report may be available before the Board adopts its budget for the 1985-86 school year.

By consensus, the Board changed the membership to read "representatives from each high school cluster," added a statement that a final report would be due in the spring, and added four students to the committee.

Resolution No. 557-84                      Re: Area 2 Task Force

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education and the school system, as well as all students in Area 3, have benefited from the wise advice and excellent recommendations from the Area 3 Task Force, established by the Board in 1983 to advise the Board on Area 3 program and facility needs; and

WHEREAS, The Board has recognized that these area program and facility needs in Area 2 must be addressed, on which the Board needs the advice and recommendations of parents and other citizens; and

WHEREAS, The Board wishes to make certain that the advice it receives takes account of its five priorities, adopted in 1983 and reaffirmed in 1984; and

WHEREAS, The Board would like to be able to take account of Area 2 needs identified by the task force in the 1985-86 school year budget; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education establish an Area 2 Task Force, the purpose of which shall be to identify program and facility needs in Area 2 schools which should be addressed by the school system; and be it further

Resolved, That the task force shall give advice on how its recommendations support and strengthen the school system's efforts to achieve the objectives set forth in the Board of Education's five priorities; and be it further

Resolved, That the task force shall be comprised of representatives from each high school cluster in Area 2, and in addition shall include one principal from each level (elementary, JIM and high school) and one teacher from each level, four students (two JIM and two senior high school) and four other citizens chosen for their areawide and/or countywide perspective, but residing in Area 2; and be it further

Resolved, That the task force shall have a liaison person designated by the superintendent to work with the task force and shall operate under the regulations the Board has established for its advisory committees, including election by the task force of its own chairperson; and be it further

Resolved, That the task force shall convene as soon as possible, so that at least a preliminary report may be available before the Board adopts its budget for the 1985-86 school year and so that its final report can be submitted in the spring of 1985.

Re: New Business

1. Mr. Ewing moved and Miss DUBY seconded that his proposal for a commission on excellence in teaching be placed on a Board agenda for discussion and action.
2. Dr. Cody called the Board's attention to the plaques honoring former Board members which had been placed in the Board Room at the request of Board members.

Re: Items of Information

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Follow-up on Board/staff Priorities
2. Monthly Financial Report

Resolution No. 558-84                      Re: Adjournment

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 12:15

a.m. to go into executive session.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw